REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now pending in the application. Applicant would first like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's counsel during the telephonic interview conducted on October 8, 2009. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Once again Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's counsel during the telephonic interview. During the interview, claims 1 and 4 were discussed. The focus of the interview dealt with the following issues

Cresci and McKinley were discussed with regards to claims 1 and 4;
Limitiations, "restrict a user", "simple control unit", and "deciding unit" were discussed with regard to the cited art and applicant's disclosure.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 2, 9-10 and 13 are objected to because the status identifiers were incorrect. Applicant has corrected the identifiers and resubmits these claims for review.

Applicant has also corrected a minor typographical error in claim 15 (punctuation period at end of claim is added).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKinley Jr. (4,479,240) in view of Cresci, et al. (7,245,727). McKinley relates to an audio mixing console with control element position storage. Cresci relates to a remote controlled audio mixing console. In Cresci the mixing console is adapted to communicate over a network, such as the internet; each controlled element (e.g. potentiometer) is separately addressable over that network. A portable communication device sends software commands to the controlled elements to change their settings.

The applicant's invention is different from McKinley and Cresci. In applicant's invention the mixing unit and simple control unit are separate devices. The mixing unit has a control system that applies a mixing process to effect changes in the output resultant signals based on user-settable parameters, each parameter being variable over a predefined range. Thus for example, the control system might include a parametric EQ stage that allows user-settable control over the center frequency of the EQ. That center frequency might be variable, for example, over a range from 50Hz. to 2500Hz.

In applicant's system the simple control unit is in data communication with the mixing unit. A user of the simple control unit can input desired values of parameters which are sent to the mixing unit. But rather than simply accepting the desired input parameter values, the mixing unit employs a deciding unit that tests whether the desired parameter is within a user-specified subset of the predefined range available for that control. These user-specified subsets are stored in a storing device associated with the mixing unit. If the desired parameter is within the user-specified subset, then that value is passed to the mixing unit; if not the desired value is not passed to the mixing unit.

Thus, for example, an audio engineer can store in the storing device a limited range for the parametric EQ: establishing that the center frequency can be varied only between 50Hz and 150Hz, for example. Thus if a novice user of the simple control unit adjusts the center frequency to 75Hz, the deciding unit will pass the 75Hz value to the mixing unit and the parametric EQ will be set accordingly. On the other hand, if the novice user of the simple control unit adjusts the center frequency to 500Hz., the deciding unit will recognize that this desired setting is outside the permitted range established by the audio engineer and it will not pass the desired 500Hz value to the mixing unit.

Neither McKinley nor Cresci teach or suggest this feature. McKinley is simply a mixing unit that can store preset parameter settings for later recall. Cresci is designed to remotely control a mixing unit via internet or network connection in a master-slave fashion and thus contemplates that the recording engineer working remotely would have full access to the control ranges.

In order to more fully distinguish applicant's invention in this regard, new claim 16 is presented. The new claim recites that the deciding unit passes the desired value (from the simple control unit) if it is within a user-specified subset associated with the given parameter, otherwise it does not pass the desired value if the desired value is not within the user-specified subset. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 16 fully distinguishes applicant's invention from McKinley and Cresci.

Regarding claims 1-15, applicants have amended the independent claims to make it more clear that the simple control unit comprises a console panel that is physically separate from the mixing unit. Thus these claims now even more fully

distinguish over McKinley. As for the remote controlled capabilities of Cresci, applicant requests reconsideration for the reason that Cresci is simply providing remote control of addressable digital potentiometers and switches—without restricting the applicable range of these devices. Thus applicant respectfully submits that the present claim language distinguishes over Cresci. For example, claim 1 recites

> a deciding unit that is responsive to authorization parameter identifying information which identifies a subset of respective parameters that the simple control unit is authorized to modify among the respective parameters indicated in the certain detailed setting information, and which restricts a user of the simple control unit from modifying respective parameters that are not among the subset of respective parameters.

If the Examiner considers the IP address of the digital potentiometer in Cresci to be the claimed "authorization parameter identifying information," then there is no support in Cresci for making a decision based on "a subset of respective parameters." To effect such selective control Cresci would need to restrict certain IP address ranges that are associated with authorization parameters—a feature that is not needed and not contemplated by Cresci. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the claims distinguish over Cresci, which does not employ subsets of respective parameters and does not restrict a user from modifying respective parameters that are not among the subset. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 3, 2009___

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/_____
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No.: 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

15124412.1